REMARKS

Claims 1-61 are pending. The remarks presented herein are in response to the Office Action dated December 21, 2006. Claims 1, 15, 29, 30, 43, 55, 57 and 58 have been amended, claims 59-61 have been added, and claims 12, 13, 40 and 41 are canceled. After entry of this amendment, claims 1-11, 14-39, and 42-61 will be pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-8, 11, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claimed invention describes methods and systems for assisted network browsing. Claim 1, as amended, recites a method comprising:

receiving an interest signal indicating an interest in a hyperlink contained in a first document;

generating a request for third-party-provided information about a second document associated with the hyperlink, **the third-party-provided information providing an indication of the disruptiveness and/or liveness of the second document**;

receiving the third-party-provided information; and

causing the third-party-provided information to be output in association with the first document.

Claim 29, as amended, recites a method comprising:

receiving a request for third-party-provided information about a second document associated with a hyperlink contained in a first document, **the third-party-provided information providing an indication of the disruptiveness and/or liveness of the second document**;

retrieving the third-party-provided information; and

generating an information signal configured to cause the third-party-provided information to be output in association with the first document.

The Chang reference does not disclose all of the elements of claims 1 and 29, as amended. Chang generally discusses "automatic link generation" within a DynaText system. (Chang, Abstract). However, Chang fails to disclose receiving or generating a request for third-party-provided information about a second document associated with a hyperlink contained in a first document, "the third-party-provided information providing <u>an indication of the disruptiveness and/or liveness</u> of the second document."

Chang simply does not provide an indication of the disruptiveness and/or liveness of the second document. Chang merely compares the system-generated links to links previously generated by the user to assess the <u>similarity</u> between the links. However, even a comparison of the <u>most similar</u> links does not provide an <u>indication of the disruptiveness and/or liveness</u> of the second document. For example, suppose an impostor wished to have users visit his or her website, which contains multiple, disruptive pop-up advertisements. The imposter might try to make that website as similar to the previously linked websites as possible. Thus, the imposter's website would be <u>very similar</u> to the first website, but would also be very disruptive. The Chang reference would not be able to provide an indication of disruptiveness and/or liveness of the imposter's website. It could only show how similar the imposter's website is to the user's previously linked documents.

The link filter (page 151 of Chang), which allows a user to "minimize links known to be irrelevant or undesirable as link examples", does not solve this problem. While it allows the user to filter out <u>previously viewed</u> links, it does not provide any method of determining the <u>disruptiveness and/or liveness</u> of the second, not yet viewed document. (See Chang, p. 151: the user can apply filters and "use the remaining links to generate new links.") Rather, as long as the second document is "similar" to the previous links, the system in Chang will

provide a high similarity measure, regardless of the disruptiveness and/or liveness of that second document.

The claimed invention, in contrast, provides a way to determine the disruptiveness and/or liveness of the second document. For example, the claimed invention allows the determination of whether the second document is disruptive, has pop-ups or annoying music, has been updated recently, is available, has potential computer viruses, or has changed since the user last viewed it. Chang simply does not disclose an indication of the liveness and/or disruptiveness of the second document.

Claims 3-5, 7-8, 11, 14 and 15 patentably distinguish over Chang for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. All of these claims depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Moreover, all of these dependent claims also include recitations that further define the claimed invention.

For example, claim 4 recites the "method of claim 3, wherein the user-related information comprises query-related information." The Examiner relies on the link profile discussed on page 146 of Chang to show the elements of this claim. Chang states that the link profile is used to "catch relevant information", such as by using the link profiles "as the examples from which to generate new links." Nowhere does Chang state, however, that this information is output in association with the first document. As such, the limitations of claim 4 are not shown by Chang.

In addition, contrary to the Examiner's assertion with regard to claim 5, Chang does not show "causing the third-party-provided information to be output in association with the first document, wherein the third-party-provided information comprises a content snippet of the second document" or "generating an information signal configured to cause the third-

party-provided information to be output in association with the first document, wherein the third-party-provided information comprises a content snippet of the second document."

The Examiner relies on Figure 5 of Chang to show this element with respect to claim 5. Figure 5 shows an "overview of the full-text browsing window." Figure 5 discusses a "link icon indicating that there are traversable links from the current browsing section" and a "pop-up window to display a list of link destinations." In other words, Chang shows the full text of the origin document and a list of links to destination documents.

Table 1 of Chang provides more detail about what happens in that full text browsing window (right hand side of the screen, caption box in the upper right of page 146). As the caption in the center right of page 146 makes clear, when the user clicks on the link icon within the origin document, a list of traversable destination nodes is displayed. However, it is _after_ the user selects one of the items in the list of traversable links that the text of the destination document is displayed in the full-text browsing window. ("When the user selects one of the items in the list, the text in the destination node is displayed in the full-text browsing window.") Thus, it is clear, that the third-party-provided information is not output in association with the first document, wherein the third-party-provided information comprises a content snippet of the second document.

Nor is the "pop-up window to display a list of link destinations" in Figure 5 "third-party-provided information compris[ing] a content snippet of the second document." The pop-up window displays a number next to each traversable link, which is the "similarity measure." This is not a snippet of content from the second document. As such, Figure 5 simply does not show "generating an information signal configured to cause the third-party-

provided information to be output in association with the first document, wherein the third-party-provided information comprises a content snippet of the second document."

Also, claim 8 states the "method of claim 7, wherein the past-user information comprises a user-supplied rating of the second document." The Examiner cites to the "user filter" on page 151 of Chang. The discussion of filters in Chang states that the user is able to "filter out links created before a certain date or by a certain person, since all links created in the system have time and creator attributes attached to them." However, Chang does not describe the ability for a user to provide a "rating" of the second document. Thus, the limitations of this claim are not shown in the Chang reference.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Chang in view of Jun; claim 9 over Chang in view of Hansen; claim 10 over Chang in view of Ohmura; claim 12 over Chang in view of Nishi; claim 13 over Chang in view of Ponte. The Examiner also rejected claims 16, 17, 20 and 27 in view of "Applicant Admitted prior art"; claims 18, 19, 21-26, and 28 by "Official Notice"; and claims 29-58 "over the prior art made of record."

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are improper as they do not "clearly articulate" the rejection "so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability and otherwise reply completely at the earliest opportunity." MPEP 706. In particular, the Examiner does not set forth any citations showing "Applicant Admitted prior art", of what materials "Official Notice" is being taken, or "the prior art made of record."

As to the claim of "Applicant Admitted prior art", Applicants submit that they have made no admission with regard to prior art using "haptic" devices, cached documents or a "tooltip" overlay as recited in claims 16, 20 and 27. With regard to "Official Notice", the Examiner has not met the requirements of MPEP 2144.03, and relying on "official notice" is therefore improper. Applicants request that the Examiner provide documentary evidence in accordance with MPEP 2144.03 to support the reliance on "Official Notice" in the rejection of claims 18, 19, 21-26, and 28. Lastly, it is unclear which "prior art made of record" the Examiner is relying upon to reject claims 29-58. Applicants submit that claims 29, 55 and 57 are patentable over Chang for at least the same reasons described above with regard to claim 1.

Applicants further submit that claims 2, 9, 10, 16-28, 59-61 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and patentably distinguish over Chang for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. Claims 30-32, 35-39, and 42-54 depend from claims 29, either directly or indirectly, and patentably distinguish over Chang for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 29. Claim 56 depends from claim 55, and patentably distinguishes over Chang for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 55. Claim 58 depends from claim 57, and patentably distinguishes over Chang for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 57. Moreover, all of these dependent claims also include recitations that further define the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
GREGORY JOSEPH BADROS, ET AL.

Date: April 23, 2007   By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com